Lincoln h.21.

Ninety-fourth Year. Tros Tyriusque mihi nullo discrimine agetur. Vol. 188: No. 1.

THE

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW

EDITED BY GEORGE HARVEY

July, 1908.

SPECIAL ARTICLES

Queen Victoria's Letters . . . The Rt. Hon. JAMES BRYCE

Durham White Stevens . . . . Baron KOGORO TAKAHIRA

The Centennial of Lincoln and Darwin . . W. R. THAYER

Swiftness of Justice in England . . FRANCIS M. BURDICK

Some Women of Pinero's . . . . . WILLIAM H. RIDEING

Outcome of the Southern Race Question . ALBERT B. HART

Too Much Success . . . . . EDWARD S. MARTIN

What Quebec has Meant to the United States, H. ADDINGTON BRUCE

One Way of Governing Malays . . ELIZABETH W. WRIGHT

Repeal of the Fifteenth Amendment . . T. B. EDGINGTON

The New Ireland. V. . . . . SYDNEY BROOKS

Need of Departments of School Hygiene . . W. H. ALLEN

The Alleged Passing of Wagner . . . LAWRENCE GILMAN

Grover Cleveland . . . . . THE EDITOR

NEW BOOKS REVIEWED

Brown's "Rose Macleod" . . . OLIVIA HOWARD DUNBAR

Campbell's "Christianity and the Social Order," CHARLES JOHNSTON

WORLD POLITICS

London: History of the Anglo-French Understanding; Significance of the King's Visit to the Tsar; The Government's Attitude toward Woman Suffrage. St. Petersburg: Unexpected Success of the Movement for Parliamentary Government; Independence of the Duma; The Amur Railway Project. Washington: The Republican National Convention; The Nominees; The Platform; Have the Democrats an Opportunity?

THE EDITOR'S DIARY

White Rock

"The World's Best Table Water"

Funniest book of the year, "Richard's Poor Almanack," beautifully bound and illustrated, sent for 10c. Address White Rock, Flatiron Building, New York.

THE CENTENNIAL OF LINCOLN AND DARWIN.

BY WILLIAM ROSCOE THAYER.

On February 12th, 1909, fall the centennials of Abraham Lincoln and of Charles Darwin. Already we hear that preparations are making in England and America to celebrate their birthdays. The British scientific bodies will doubtless do full honor to Darwin, the greatest of modern men of science, not only in Great Britain, but in the civilized world. In like manner our American historical societies, perhaps even Congress and some of our State and city governments, may be counted on to commemorate Abraham Lincoln. But is this enough? Does not destiny itself, which saw to it that the foremost Briton and the foremost American of the nineteenth century should come into life on the same day of the same year, seem to point out that Britain and the United States should unite in celebrating this centennial? In all history, there is no other similar coincidence.

The Twelfth of February, the birthday of Lincoln and Darwin, should be a day of international festival, a sort of Pan-Anglo-Saxon reunion, in which the scattered members of a great race should come together to reaffirm their racial principles, to feel the thrill of common hopes and common emotions, and to realize in the most convincing way that blood is thicker than water.

Public or national celebrations are never so fruitful as when they have for their object a person. The personifying instinct is one of the strongest in the hearts of men—so strong that, even when abstractions or principles are the theme, the orator and the poet, and the philosopher not less than they, clothe these abstractions with living garments of personality which even children can recognize. Now, it happens that Lincoln and Darwin embodied many of the most characteristic qualities of our race.

What have been the great English political ideals in govern-

ment, as they have been unfolded century by century, sometimes retarded, sometimes checked, but never abandoned? These have been the belief in representation and the belief in law. No King who ruled in England after the Conquest was so absolute that he could safely disregard the rights of his subjects. No tyrant could ever crush out of them the conviction that, if they were to be called upon to pay taxes and to provide military service, they must have a share in the government. That share, once secured, grew and grew until representation has become the dominant principle not only in the British Parliament, but in every nation, state, city or village which Englishmen planted or their sons now govern. This principle leads straight to Democracy—that political ideal which, beyond all others, acknowledges the obligation of making of every member of the state a citizen, and of giving all citizens liberty and equality at the voting-booth and in the courts.

But Anglo-Saxon Democracy would not be what it is, if it had not been worked out in a spirit peculiar to our race—the spirit which manifests itself in honorable compromise and in great-souled toleration. Compromise, which is not to be confounded with the base truckling, log-rolling and dishonest bargains of the politicians, has been found by long experience to be the best method by which most necessary improvements can be secured—and kept. The free political evolution of a people should be a growth; if it be not this, it may be a succession of conflicting whims and ambitions, violent but not deep, in which individuals and cliques take the place of parties and principles. To accept a compromise in cases where conscience sanctions it has been the Anglo-Saxon way: and party government, in which first one side and then the other makes the laws,—and thereby in the long run both sides record their principles on the statute-book—is also, in essence, a form of compromise.

With this has grown up toleration, the willingness to respect an adversary's opinion, the recognition that the general intellectual and moral health of a country is best served by allowing free play to all sorts of creeds and thinkers, if they do not seek to destroy society itself. Toleration did not spring up and flourish among Anglo-Saxons in a moment; but the conscience of our race accepted it long before conduct, which lags behind good resolutions, was generally practising it. And although England

was shaken by dynastic, religious and civil wars, she organized no Inquisition to take, like Frankenstein's monster, a terrible vengeance on its creator; she furnished no counterpart to the wholesale expulsion of the Huguenots from France or of the Moriscoes from Spain; and now, for above two hundred years, she has seen the representatives of her chief interests and the upholders of antagonistic political theories sit side by side at Westminster, in tolerance, if not in harmony. And America in this respect has not fallen short of the Mother's example. Less than half a century ago, our country was torn by a civil war whose causes had roots too deep for compromise, in two incompatible, mutually destructive civilizations. Yet, when the issue had been fought out, there followed no proscriptions, no batches of victims for the scaffold, no hosts of exiles, no legalized sequestrations, no multitudes rotting in political prisons.

Now, these great Anglo-Saxon principles and Democracy itself were most nobly embodied during the nineteenth century in Abraham Lincoln. Nothing could destroy his belief in popular government. Neither the abuse of enemies, nor the harsh criticism of friends, nor military defeats nor political defection could turn or embitter or disconcert him. He, indeed, probably to a greater degree than any other ruler in history, kept steadily before him the realization that the interests of all the people were his sacred charge. He would practise compromise up to the very line where compromise ceases to be a virtue. His large tolerance had malice toward none and charity for all. And he possessed to the full the Anglo-Saxon respect for law as the means to the protection of every individual, no matter how humble, and to the equal and impartial distribution of justice. Among the Latin peoples and the Germans the law is feared, rather than respected, because it has served as the instrument for punishment or restraint, instead of for protection; an ally of the hated police and of despotic governments. But Lincoln in this regard truly represented our race: and when through the exigences of a colossal war he had thrust upon him powers which were practically unlimited, he used them lawfully, aiming only at justice, righteousness and charity. It is hardly an exaggeration to say that he showed how even a dictatorship may be constitutional.

The British world may unite with America, therefore, in celebrating Abraham Lincoln as the pattern and exemplar of the

fundamental political ideals of our Anglo-Saxon race. Wherever men would learn the type of citizen and ruler, of law-giver and law-abider, which Anglo-Saxon Democracy reveres, they may turn to him. Democracy, which was but a germ in the Witenagemot, and but a tender shoot at Runnymede, came to its fruit in him.

And so Charles Darwin summed up what I believe to be the noblest intellectual characteristics of our race. He was not merely an indefatigable investigator and a penetrating observer, not merely slow to assert and quick to listen to criticism, but he was modest, generous and utterly truthful. Unlike many great men of science, he was neither opinionated nor doctrinaire: and he loved truth, even when it seemed to imperil his theory. When we think of him, there does not rise up the figure of the typical *Gelehrter*—the astonishing specialist, and nothing more—but of a great personality that included (but was not hemmed in by) the master scientist. His honesty, his candor, his quiet courage, his magnanimity, his large simplicity and sound humanity, in a word, his moral qualities, added—who can say how much?—to his intellectual efficiency. Darwin was as solicitous to be just to every fact as Lincoln was to treat every man and every opinion with perfect fairness: and they did so without any apparent urging by conscience. Their acts were so shaped by the habit of duty that they seemed inevitably righteous.

Looked at from one point of view, the chief effort of men during the past four hundred years has been to try to *rationalize* the world in which we live. This they have accomplished by discovering its processes and the laws which govern them. The Ultimate Cause still eludes pursuit, but we know and control our actual world as men never did before. At all points it seems to behave reasonably in proportion as our reason has mastered it. Steam, for instance, which, until so short a time ago, was only a tricksy vapor, to be whiffed away with the first breath, now furnishes most of the power by which civilized nations manufacture and travel. Electricity, also, still more elusive, and invisible besides, has been rationalized. And so of everything.

Darwin is the embodied Reason, seeking its own in the material world, and especially in organic life. He finds a larger order, where there were caprice, partial chaos and ignorance. He divines a cosmic law to replace primitive legends. He is afraid of nothing—not even of the Truth.

The obligation which life in a rationalized world imposes upon us is to be rational ourselves, to respect and train our reason so that we may trust it, and above all to cleave to truth. When systems dissolve, the only salvation for each individual is to believe what to him is the highest truth. For in such times, "canned" beliefs, put up by institutional packing-houses, no longer nourish.

Charles Darwin stands as the great prototype of modern Truth-seekers, Truth-speakers, and Truth-reverers. They are found now in every land, in every trade, profession and calling. But though his doctrines and disciples are spread throughout the earth, he belongs to our common Anglo-Saxon race, and Americans, not less than Englishmen, should honor his centennial.

If, as some of us hope, the allied mission of England and of the United States is but beginning,—if the principles which found expression in the development of both nations,—if the ideals which have been held by both peoples,—if the works of genius which, thanks to a common language, are the inheritance of every Englishman and of every American,—have not lost their potency, then let us draw closer together, and recognize more clearly our indelible kinship and our common destiny. The fluctuations of friendship and hostility which newspapers, politicians and designing ministers try to create can have no effect against nations conscious of the deepest racial sympathies. On these alone, we cannot too often repeat, the durable international alliances must rest. The bonds of commerce should make for peace and amity, but these bonds a sudden strain of competition may snap: at their strongest, they are only tow compared with the intellectual, moral and spiritual affinities that bind the souls of a race together. Just as the friendship of man and man, or the love of man and woman, depends neither on wealth nor physical qualities, but on ideals, so has it ever been, so will it always be, with nations.

The United States and England have to-day these reasons for friendship. Other nations, other races have pressed forward, each with its different principles, methods and ambitions. Let our Anglo-Saxon peoples declare February Twelfth the holiday of their race, and celebrate together Lincoln, the embodiment of Anglo-Saxon devotion to Justice, and Darwin, the incarnation of Anglo-Saxon devotion to Truth.

WILLIAM ROSCOE THAYER.

SWIFTNESS AND CERTAINTY OF JUSTICE IN ENGLAND AND THE UNITED STATES.

BY FRANCIS M. BURDICK, DWIGHT PROFESSOR OF LAW IN COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.

THE lame and halting gait of American justice has become a matter of frequent comment and regret, even by the learned persons whose business it is to dispense it. Quite recently a Supreme Court Judge of New York, on his return from England, was reported by the daily press to have said that "England's justice is much swifter than ours." Referring to a murder trial, which he attended in London, and which lasted but a day, he declared that "in this country it would have lasted a week." Similar opinions have been expressed by other judges, as well as by practising lawyers, who have watched the trial of cases in English courts. But a few months since a committee of the Alabama State Bar Association sent out a circular containing some very suggestive statistics, from which it appears that there are twelve times as many homicides in New England annually as in London; seventy-five times as many in California, and two hundred and forty-five times as many in Nevada. Commenting on these statistics, the committee said: "It is believed that the certainty and swiftness of justice in England and the lack of them in the United States account, in a large measure, for the wide difference in the number of crimes in the two countries."

That a very marked difference in the swiftness and certainty of justice between England and the United States does exist admits of no doubt. It was emphasized—perhaps unduly exaggerated for most persons—by the Thaw and Rayner murder trials. In each case the evidence of the killing by the accused was undisputed, and the only legal defence was that of the prisoner's insanity at the time of the homicide. The Rayner